

Submission of Replacement Formal Drawings

Submitted herewith is a replacement formal drawing sheet for Figure 8 in order to label it as "Prior Art". Approval and entry of this replacement drawing sheet is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the objection and rejection, and further examination are requested.

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 stand rejected. Claim 4 is objected to. Claims 1-4 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Figure 8 should be labeled as “Prior Art” because only that which is old is illustrated. Submitted herewith is a replacement drawing sheet of Figure 8 labeled as “Prior Art”. No new matter has been added. As a result, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. A substitute specification and abstract including the revisions have been prepared and are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added. Also submitted herewith are marked-up copies of the substitute specification and abstract indicating the changes incorporated therein.

Claim 3 has been objected to. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that in the second line of claim 3, the phrase “in the second sustaining period, duration in which the transition...” should be amended to “in the second sustaining period, [the] duration in which the transition...” The Applicants have amended claim 3 to positively recite “a period” in place of “duration”. As a result, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

The Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner’s indication that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of claim 1, and thus should now be allowable.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,781) (hereinafter referred to as “Hashimoto”).

The above-mentioned rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to amended claim 1 for the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires a method of driving a plasma display panel including, in part, dividing one field period into a plurality of sub-fields, each comprising an initializing period, a writing period, and a sustaining period, and applying a ramp voltage waveform or a gradually changing waveform during the initialization period to cause an initializing discharge.

Hashimoto discloses a method of driving an AC plasma display panel. Specifically, Hashimoto discloses (in Figures 19 and 21) waveforms of voltages applied to a column electrode Wj, a first row electrode Xi and a second row electrode Yi. During a reset period, a priming pulse Pxp is applied to the electrode Xi to perform a full-screen write and a full-screen erase, and a pulse Pwp is applied to the electrode Wj at the same timing as the pulse Pxp. The Pxp and Pwp pulses are rectangularly-shaped pulses that have sudden and abrupt jumps in voltage, and equally abrupt returns and may be applied every several sub-fields or every sub-field. A sustain pulse Sp is applied to cause the sustain discharge, an assistant pulse Subp1 is applied before the sustain discharge, an assistant pulse Subp2 is applied after the sustain discharge, a scan pulse Scyp is applied to perform a scan and an addressing pulse is applied according to display data.

In contrast to the invention of claim 1, Hashimoto does not disclose applying a ramp voltage waveform or a gradually changing waveform during the reset period to cause an initializing discharge. Instead, Hashimoto discloses applying rectangularly-shaped pulses Pxp and Pwp in the reset period that have sudden and abrupt jumps in voltage and equally abrupt returns. Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion to modify the pulses Pxp and Pwp such that they include ramps or gradually changing waveforms. In other words, Hashimoto does not disclose applying a ramp voltage waveform or a gradually changing waveform during an initializing period to cause an initializing discharge.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is believed clear that claim 1 is not anticipated by Hashimoto. Furthermore, it is submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of record that would have caused an ordinary artisan to modify the art of record in such a manner, as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions of claim 1.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed that claim 1, and claims 2-3 depending therefrom, are patentable over the references relied upon in the rejection. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-3 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record. Moreover, because

claim 4 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 1, it is submitted that claim 4 is also clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenji OGAWA et al.

By: Kevin McDermott
Kevin McDermott
Registration No. 48,113
Attorney for Applicants

KM/km
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 5, 2007